half the property alone should go to the wife. Another objection to the Bill raised by the Member was that its provisions did not affect Makkathayam Ezhavas. That would be destructive of uniformity as regards the community as a whole and was not therefore a desirable restriction of the scope of the proposed law. Lastly, the Member touched upon *tavazhee* partition which, he said, was highly desirable; but he suggested two modifications to clause 27 of the Bill, *viz.*, (*a*) that partition should be so effected as to give equal shares to all the *tavazhees*, irrespective of the number of Members in each, and (*b*) that partition should give only the right of enjoyment and not that of alienation.

Dewan's reply.—This again is in the nature of a criticism on a Bill that is already before the Legislative Council. The Bill has been referred to a Select Committee, and it is going to be threshed out in all the details by the Committee. The observations of the Member will be referred to that Committee for its consideration. The representations already received on the subject have been sent to the Committee who are waiting to see if any more representations will come, so that they may consider the subject from all aspects. I am afraid that it is too late in the day to say that the Ezhava Law Committee which was appointed to examine the question of Ezhava inheritance, did not go about its work in the proper way. We must recognise that it was a responsible Committee and that it tried to do its work well and that its considered conclusions deserve the serious attention of the public as well as of Government. The Bill is the result of the deliberations of that Committee. It does not follow that the Bill as drafted should be passed intact by the Legislative Council. The Bill will be subjected to close scrutiny both by the Select Committee and by the Legislative Council.

35. The desirability of expunging the provision relating to the registration of canoes from the Public Canals and Ferries Regulation, I of 1084.

Mr. Lukka Mathai (Member, Changanacherry Taluk) represented that the Public Canals and Ferries Regulation was an enactment opposed to all sound principles of legislation and taxation, that it was fraught with evils and inconveniences, that the advantages, if any, derived therefrom, were quite disproportionate to the inconveniences and troubles caused thereby, that it was an impediment to the punja cultivators of Kuttanad and that it worked hardship both to the owner and the hirer of a boat. The Member's main objection was to the levying of "registration fees" on all boats above one ton. He viewed this as a tax on either the owner or the hirer of the boat and he showed, by a calculation of the average annual income from a boat, that neither the owner nor the hirer derived such income as would justify the imposition of any tax. The average daily income of the hirer of a boat, the Member put at Chs. 14½, and the registration fee amounted to cash 8 a day on this poor income. Such an income-tax, he said, was unjustifiable and unheard of in any other part of the world. Further, the rule requiring the registration of all boats above one ton would work considerable hardship on the punja cultivators of Kuttanad. It had been their lot, the Member said, to live in a portion of the State where they could not do without boats, and hence it was unfair that Government should take advantage of their unavoidable necessity by levying a tax on their very means of existence. He pointed out that the recent amending Bill, if passed, would work greater hardship, since the exemption in the existing Regulation in favour of boats used for private purposes did not find a place in the Bill. The Member finally prayed that, in view of the above facts and of the repeated representations by Assembly Members, deputations, &c., regarding the inconveniences and hardships to the public caused by the Regulation, Government might be pleased to repeal it.

Dewan's reply.—I do not think that I should say much on this subject. The Bill has been just passed by the Legislative Council. It has been observed by the Member that the Bill is opposed to all canons of legislation. Such a sweeping criticism deserves no answer. The Legislation was undertaken with a view to make the law on the subject conform to that in British India and Cochin. If we have erred, we have erred in good company. The object of the Government is not to molest the ryot; on the contrary, if you take out a license in Travancore under the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

new Regulation you will be exempt from it in British India and Cochin. It is going to be a blessing and not a molestation as the Member seems to fear.

36. Abrogation of the rule regarding the passing of Motor vehicles along ghat roads at nights.

Mr. J. S. B. Wallace (Member, Kannan Devan Planters' Association) represented that the planting community experienced considerable hardship from the enforcement of the rule regarding the passing of motor vehicles along ghat roads at nights. Since sending up his memorandum of subjects he was informed that the rule had been cancelled. He however learned from Mr. Cantlay, Member, Central Travancore Planters' Association, that the rule was still being enforced and urged that the cancellation be brought into force without delay.

Dewan's reply.—The rule has been abrogated. A notification regarding the abrogation of the rule was, I believe, published some time ago. It generally takes some time to convey the information to the District authorities.

37. The creation of the post of a Division Assistant at Tiruvalla and the appointment to the post of one selected from a community not now eligible to serve in the higher ranks of the Revenue Department.

Mr. K. I. Kochipp n Mappilla (Member, Municipal Council, Tiruvalla) represented that in point of population, education, material wealth and general health, Tiruvalla stood foremost in the State and that the appointment of a Division Assistant and First Class Magistrate at Tiruvalla had been pressed on the attention of Government for some time past, especially as the Division First Class Magistrates' Court in Quilon was not at all convenient to the people in the northern taluks beyond Mavelikara. The Member understood that an additional Court was to be opened some where else in the Division. In his opinion, Tiruvalla would be the most convenient station in the Division. It was on account of the importance of the taluk that the Tahsildar had been for some time invested with First Class powers. As regards the filling up of the appointment, the Member submitted that the existing barriers against the office being held by certain classes of His Highness' subjects should be removed and that the 26 lakhs of the population to whom the right of entering the higher ranks of certain services was now denied, might be conciliated by selecting one from among them.

Dewan's reply.—The first point raised is the creation of the post of a Division Assistant in the Quilon Division. This is engaging the attention of Government. The place where the office of that Division Assistant should be located will also be looked into. In regard to the Member's request that the officer to be appointed for the new post should come from a community not at present eligible to serve in the higher ranks of the Revenue department, I do not think that a separate declaration of policy is necessary, as Government have already said that it is their policy to give representation in Government service to all sections of the people.

38. Necessity for establishing a Munsiff's Court at Pattanamtitta, and bringing under its jurisdiction the pakuthies of Pattanamtitta, Ranni, Elanthur, Kumbazha, Cherukole, Omallur, Vallicode, Pandalam North and Mallapuzhaseri.

Mr. Narayanan Govindan (Member, Pattanamtitta Taluk) after expressing the love and esteem which the inhabitants of the taluk entertained towards His Highness and His Highness' Government for having favoured them with a Taluk Cutcherry at Pattanamtitta and thus remedied the many troubles and inconveniences felt by the inhabitants of the locality in the matter of revenue affairs, etc., represented that the decision of the authorities that in the absence of a treasury anywhere in the vicinity they were unable to recommend a Munsiff's Court for the place, had caused much disappointment to the local public. But now that a treasury had been attached to the Taluk Cutcherry recently opened, the original objection against the establishment of a Munsiff's Court did not hold good. Further, in view of the fact that the places under reference were fast rising in importance and the distance from them to the Munsiff's court at Adur and Chengannur exceeded 40 miles and the way lay through bad roads intersected by rivers and canals highly inconvenient and even dangerous

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly